



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,844	12/21/2004	Benoit Saliou	FR 020068	1283
24737	7590	01/11/2008	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			KIM, TAE K	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2153	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/518,844	SALIOU ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tae K. Kim	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the Applicant's arguments filed on October 24, 2007.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, and 14 have been amended. Claims 1 - 15, of which Claims 1 and 2 are in independent form, are pending and presented for examination.

Claim Objections

With regards to the amendments made to Claims 8 and 9 to correct the spelling, examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claims 8 and 9.

With regards to the amendments made to Claim 10 for being an improper dependent claim, the examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claim 10.

With regards to the objection of Claim 11 for being an improper dependent claim, the examiner has withdrawn the objection to Claim 11 since it was not improper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 5 and 9 – 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Regarding Claim 5, the boot sector is stated to be within the storage unit (as per Claim 2) and thus cannot be located in a separate area from the storage unit.

Regarding Claims 9 – 11, the means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means and, therefore, has undue breadth. See *In Re Hyatt*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A computer program product and a signal are non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 9 and 12 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Appl. 2001/0011347 A1 filed by Shanthala Narayanaswamy et al. (hereinafter referenced as “Narayanaswamy”) in view of view of the article “Fully Reprogrammable Fault-Tolerant FLASH Memory System,” printed on the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin (hereinafter referenced as "IBM").

1. Regarding Claim 1, Narayanaswamy discloses a transmission system and a method (Title; Fig. 3; Para. 0007, 0008, and 0009) of downloading software programs into a storage unit, the software programs including a boot code and an application

code (Para. 0003 and 0004; upgrading and remapping of the boot and main firmware codes), the boot code allowing downloading of the application code (Para. 0035, 0036, and 0038; boot code checks data to determine if new main firmware is available, then downloads new firmware), the storage unit comprising at least a current boot code (Para. 0007; two separate regions to store boot code, one active, one inactive), the method comprising of: upon a download request, downloading a new boot code in a location, which does not overwrite the current boot code (Para. 0007, Lines 5-8; two separate regions to store boot code, one active, one inactive; download new boot code into inactive region); indicating that the new boot code replaces the current boot code (Para. 0029 and 0030; upon verification of download, terminal reboots and overwrites the processor vector table with the vector table copy of the new boot code); downloading a new application code associated to the new boot code in a location which does not overwrite the new boot code (Para. 0035, 0036, 0037, and 0038; if new main firmware is found, it is downloaded to another memory location separate from boot codes and old firmware); and indicating that the new application code is valid (Para. 0038; reset command after successful transfer). Narayanaswamy, however, does not disclose that the new boot code is downloaded in the section that has the current application code and overwrites the current application code.

IBM discloses a method of reprogramming the non-boot block of the storage unit with the new boot code and reprogramming the new non-boot block with new non-critical code (Pg. 4). The non-boot code can be the application code for the firmware. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, to

combine the teachings of Narayanaswamy and IBM to efficiently update firmware.

Rewriting over older blocks of storage allows an electronic apparatus to utilize more of the storage unit for the application code since two separate storage blocks are not used for the new boot code and the old boot code. Furthermore, this allows the firmware of various electrical devices to be stored in smaller storage units.

2. Regarding Claim 2, Narayanaswamy discloses a transmission system and a method (Title; Fig. 3; Para. 0007, 0008, and 0009) of downloading software programs into a storage unit, the software programs including a boot code and an application code (Para. 0003 and 0004; upgrading and remapping of the boot and main firmware codes), the boot code allowing downloading of the application code (Para. 0035, 0036, and 0038; boot code checks data to determine if new main firmware is available, then downloads new firmware), the storage unit comprising at least a current software program stored including a current boot code stored in the storage unit at a first position (Para. 0007; two separate regions to store boot code, one active, one inactive; download new boot code into inactive region), the method comprising of: defining a boot sector for jumping to a position of the storage unit where a boot code is stored in order to validate the use of said boot code (Para. 0007; two separate regions to store boot code, one active, one inactive; download new boot code into inactive region and use active boot code until update is complete), the boot sector initially pointing at the first position, where the current boot code is stored (Para. 0007, 0029, and 0030; vector table points to “active” boot code until restart); upon a download request, downloading a new software program in a second position including a new boot code and a new

application code (Para. 0007, 0035, 0036, 0037, and 0038; new firmware includes boot code and main code, which are all downloaded in different memory sectors); jumping to the second position where the new boot code is stored (Para. 0007; two separate regions to store boot code, one active, one inactive; download new boot code into inactive region and use active boot code until update is complete). Narayanaswamy, however, does not disclose that the second position includes a portion wherein a current application code is stored.

IBM discloses a method of reprogramming the non-boot block of the storage unit with the new boot code and reprogramming the new non-boot block with new non-critical code (Pg. 4). The non-boot code can be the application code for the firmware. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of Narayanaswamy and IBM to efficiently update firmware. Rewriting over older blocks of storage allows an electronic apparatus to utilize more of the storage unit for the application code since two separate storage blocks are not used for the new boot code and the old boot code. Furthermore, this allows the firmware of various electrical devices to be stored in smaller storage units.

3. Regarding Claims 3 and 5, Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. IBM further discloses that the step of jumping to the second position where the new boot code is stored is followed by replacing the current boot code with the new boot code at the first position and then jumping to the first position (Pg. 4). IBM also discloses that the boot sector is located in a protected storage area separate from the storage unit (Pg. 4).

4. Regarding Claims 4 and 6, Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. IBM further discloses that the boot sector is located in a protected storage area of the storage unit (Pg. 4). IBM also discloses that the current boot code is stored in a protected area of the storage unit, which area can be unprotected to be overwritten under specific software conditions (Pg. 4).

5. Regarding Claim 7, Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. IBM further discloses that the new software program is stored in an area of the storage unit, which area can be protected and unprotected, to be overwritten under specific software conditions (Pg. 4).

6. Regarding Claim 8, Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, discloses all the limitations of Claim 2 above. Narayanaswamy further discloses that the new software program includes an intermediate application code, which is a link between the current application code and the new application code enabling a user to parameterize the new software program (Para. 0034, 0035, 0036, 0037, 0038; the application requests the active boot code to start checking a checksum on the data to verify that there is new firmware and confirms the checksum after the transfer is complete).

7. Regarding Claims 9 and 12 – 15, Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, discloses all the limitations of Claims 1, 2, and 8 above and further discloses a transmission system comprising of a transmitter for transmitting software programs and at least a receiver for receiving software programs transmitted by a transmission system (Fig. 3; transmission of new codes are from a separate computer and then received and processed by microprocessor within the electronic device), the receiver comprising means for carrying

out the method as claimed in any one of Claims 1 to 8. Narayanaswamy also discloses of a computer program product for a receiver computing a set of instructions, which when loaded into the receiver, causes the receiver to carry out the method as claimed in any one of Claims 1 to 8 (Para. 0003; main code is used for regular operation of the device). Furthermore, Narayanaswamy discloses of a signal for carrying a computer program, the computer program being arranged to carry out the method as claimed in Claim 1 (Fig. 3; transmission from a transmitter to a receiver can be by either analog or digital signal).

Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, in view of IBM, and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,205,458 B1 invented by Robert N. Hasburn (hereinafter referenced as “Hasburn”).

8. Regarding Claims 10 and 11, Narayanaswamy discloses all the limitations of Claim 9 as stated above. However, it does not disclose the use of a file system nor that the storage unit is a persistent memory allowing protecting/unprotecting memory area upon software instructions.

Hasburn discloses a file system using multiple address locations in the storage area (See Fig. 2, 3, and 7; Abstract; shows multiple address blocks and the use of an address decoder to select the particular memory block). Hasburn also discloses that the protected storage area can be unprotected upon specific software conditions that change the block sector value (See Fig. 6; Col. 7, Lines 6-10, 14-18). It would be have been obvious to one skilled in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the same memory blocks to toggle between active and inactive (unprotected) sections to store

software. This will prevent the delay of reinstalling the application software when it does not operate properly due to an incomplete update. Furthermore, this allows the application to use the same addresses to store the software.

Additional References

Additional references that are relevant to the pending application and not cited:

U.S. Patent 6,119,226; U.S. Patent 6,457,038 B1; U.S. Appl. 2002/0095619 A1;
U.S. Appl. 2002/0194387 A1; U.S. Appl. 2003/0084342 A1; U.S. Appl. 2002/0105955
A1

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess, can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Application/Control Number:
10/518,844
Art Unit: 2153

Page 10

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

TKK

January 2, 2008



GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100